

ELECTION/RESTRICTION:

The Examiner, in the Office Action dated April 21, 2006, required restriction to one of the following groups of claims:

Group I – Claims 1-51, drawn to short range communication, classified in class 455, subclass 41.2.

Group II - Claims 52-55 drawn to frequency identification transponders, classified in class 340, subclass 5.81.

REMARKS:

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement because the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing that (1) the inventions are independent and distinct and (2) of why searching all the claims of the application would be a serious burden.

The two criteria for making a proper Restriction Requirement between patentable distinct inventions are the following:

(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 802.01, § 806.04, § 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05 - § 806.05(i)); and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a) - § 806.04(i), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02).

The inventions are independent if there is no disclosed relationship between the groups and they are unconnected in design, operation or effect. The inventions are distinct when related and capable of separate manufacture, use or sale.

In regard to (A), the Group I and II claims inventions are not independent because the apparatus, device, method and system claims all include a reader element and the claims are connected in design, operation and effect. as shown and described in Figures 1A and 5A. The

Response to : Restriction Requirement, dated April 21, 2006

inventions are not distinct because they are not capable of separate use. The inventions are inextricably intertwined as a single apparatus, device, method, and system.

In regard to (B), MPEP § 808.02 has established that a different field of search is necessary “where it is necessary to search for one of the distinct subjects in places where no pertinent art to the other subjects exist.” Claims 1-51 and 52-55 include the same elements and are the same invention, not two different inventions. It appears to the Applicants that the Examiner, during the performance of separate searches for each of the groups (I-II), would come across ample related art to all Groups I and II claims in the above-identified group 455, subclass 41.2. Moreover, MPEP § 803 states, in part that “if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the Groups I-II is such that all of the claims may be searched together without imposing any serious burden on the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully solicited.

To fulfill Applicants’ duty to reply to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants hereby provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1 -51. Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications based on the non-elected claims.

Response to : Restriction Requirement, dated April 21, 2006


AUTHORIZATION:

The Commissioner is also hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this response to Deposit Account No. 13-4500 Order No. 0900-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: May 26, 2006

By: 
Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.
Registration No.: 18,753
(202) 857- 8010 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Morgan & Finnegan, LLP
Three World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101